

APPEAL	NABC+ FOURTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Wernher Open Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	July 29, 2009

BD#	15
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

Martin Dickau	
♠	K Q T 5
♥	A K J 4 3
♦	7 3
♣	K 5

Gary Macgregor		Summer 2009 Washington D.C.	Heather Cutting	
♠	6 4 3 2		♠	A 9 8 7
♥	T 8 5		♥	7
♦	K 8 6 4 2		♦	Q J T
♣	4		♣	J 9 8 7 6

Ellen Dickau	
♠	J
♥	Q 9 6 2
♦	A 9 5
♣	A Q T 3 2

West	North	East	South
			1♣ ¹
Pass	1♥	Pass	2♥
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♥ ²
Pass	4♠ ³	Pass	5♥
Pass	6♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	6♥ by North
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	Made 6, N/S +1430
Director Ruling	4♥ N made 6, N/S +680
Committee Ruling	6♥ N made 6 N/S +1430

(1)	Shows 4+ clubs.
(2)	Alleged BIT.
(3)	Keycard Blackwood.

The Facts: The director was called after the hand was played. West thought the BIT was noticeable. South said she was deciding what to do. North did not notice a BIT.

The Ruling: The director determined that there was a BIT that demonstrably suggested pushing to slam. 4♥ was considered to be a logical alternative to 4♠. In accordance with Laws 16B1 and 12C1(e), the result was adjusted to 4♥ by North making six, N/S plus 680 for both sides.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. East was the only player that did not attend the hearing.

N/S said the BIT was not significant – about five seconds. North said she bid 2♠ because N/S often raise hearts with three card support. This bid was likely to allow North to learn whether South had four hearts.

West said there was a noticeable BIT but not abnormally long. West thought that if North intended to bid aggressively he did not have to bid 2♠ first and could have bid 4♠ directly over 2♥.

The Decision: The committee believed there was no unmistakable BIT and accordingly no irregularity. Therefore, the table result of 6♥ by North making six, N/S plus 1430 was restored for both sides.

The committee decided that based on the N/S system, North had a good reason to bid 2♠ at matchpoints rather than ask for controls immediately. The committee believed that a 5-second pause over a game try was appropriate and that bidding faster might in fact convey UI.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chair), Jeff Aker, Ellen Kent, Lou Reich and Aaron Silverstein.

Commentary:

Goldsmith There was a BIT. Look at South's hand. She had an acceptance of the 2♠ game try. Can she possibly have more than that? Then look at North's hand. Leaping into Blackwood with two small diamonds and a 16-count is ridiculous. The director got it right. Furthermore, I'd award an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) and a procedural penalty.

Polisner My approximation of an appropriate amount of time to act in such auctions is 3.5 to 4.5 seconds and an extra 0.5 second is not enough to be considered an unmistakable hesitation. Good work by the committee.

Rigal I'm just about convinced of the committee decision. I'd hope to take five seconds over such a decision so would regard that as not being a BIT – but committees are clearly sending mixed signals about what does or does not constitute a BIT. That said, does a slow 3♥ represent demonstrably a near-4♥ bid? Could it be instead a hand with 1-3-4-5 shape and a minimum not prepared to bid 3♦(A/Q10x/xxxx/AQ10xx). Or a hand considering 2NT? (Jx/Qxx/KJx/AQxxx). Who knows? This should have been mentioned, I think, in the decision.

Smith I'm not convinced by the committee. Five seconds over a game try seems to me to be potentially significant depending on South's tempo for other bids. How long did it take her to bid 2♥, I wonder? Why did the committee just accept on faith that this sequence was designed to discover whether South had a three card or four card raise? Shouldn't that be on the convention card, or in system notes, or even Alerted? What is South supposed to bid if she doesn't hold four hearts? And if the agreement is as stated, what was South thinking about for five seconds? Is that North hand right for a blast to slam via Blackwood knowing only that partner has four trumps and a minimum? What about two possible diamond losers? So while I am not saying all isn't as the committee perceived, I am saying that I think the committee did not do all the spadework necessary to satisfy me that it came to the correct conclusion. And just so it doesn't seem that I am critical of the committee while being soft on the directors, where was the player poll before deciding that bidding 4♥ was a logical alternative?

Wildavsky I like the committee decision.

Wolff Good ruling.